KEEP THE BAN

CHILD MOLESTING - Homosexuals, less than 2% of the population, commit one-third of all reported child molesting (Bell and Weinberg, Psychological Report, 1986). Presently, on military posts and bases, almost all of these crimes are committed by non-military personnel. Allowing homosexuals in our military will cause an increase in molesting of their children. This is uncalled for, atrocious, and an evil crime. Must our military be burdened with this problem? This threat is hurting morale now. Children need to be kept in the current low risk environment. Homosexuals even have their own pedophilia magazine. Homosexuals will molest children. This is supported by media coverage weekly. This hostile threat puts the Armed Forces in a quandary. They have taken an oath to obey the President, but what about their parental responsibility to protect their children? Homosexuals want to adopt children as part of their agenda. Who speaks for the children?

Serving Honorably - Those few homosexuals in the military are a much lower percentage than the general population. Who cares about the Dutch miliary? What wars have the Dutch won? Transfer all homosexuals to the Dutch military. The U.S. Military has had to discharge thousands, at great cost, because homosexuals have deceitfully lied in order to join. Lying, combined with criminal violation of the Uniform Code of Miliary Justice is a negative contribution. How can this be considered serving honorably? The following is the verbal and written oath of enlistment:

> I, _____name_____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me God.

Homophobia/Bigotry - This is fear and dislike of unacceptable acts, and it is perfectly acceptable to despise rapists, murderers, drug users, drunk drivers, etc. The Armed Forces, in particular, have a right to discriminate against unacceptable, negative, irresponsible behavior, because they have high, justifiable standards. Unit commanders and leaders should not be burdened with the loss of cohesion and morale. Lifting the ban would group together the cream of American society, the most disciplined, drug and disease-free, with an opposite group. The force should not have to accommodate a behavioral group with a negative agenda. How can someone who dislikes unacceptable acts/behavior be labeled a bigot or a homophobic?

Venereal Disease and Alcoholism - They contact VD at a rate of 20 times greater than heterosexuals (British Journal of Sexual Medicine). This is based on a norm of 500-1,000 sexual contacts in a lifetime (Bell and Weinberg). Who will pay this increase in cost? 25-33 percent of homosexuals are alcoholics (Journal of Homosexuality, 1987). Does our military need this drain on medical/VA resources? Who pays?

AIDS - HIV/AIDS was brought to the United States by a homosexual French-Canadian flight attendant. The virus was initially known as GRIDS (Gay Related...). Their epidemic has killed a quarter of a million people in the United States. A million more are HIV Positive, or have AIDS. What do they have to be gay about? Never use the term "Gay". They caused the spread to heterosexuals through blood supply, tainted needles, etc. Some unthinking, illogical people have said homosexuals are all right, as long as they don't hurt anybody. They have killed the Ryan Whites, the Kimberly Bergalises. How many have been charged with murder? None. More tax money is spent on GRIDS research per capita than is spent on cancer and heart disease research.If the ban is lifted, will President Clinton guarantee the integrity of the blood supply? HIV tainted blood has killed thousands. This will kill soldiers. Nobody joined the armed forces to be exposed to this. Two-thirds of all AIDS cases are attributable to homosexual behavior (U.S. News and World Report, April 5, 1993). Homosexuals complaining about AIDS is akin to standing in the middle of the road and complaining about traffic. They have spread the killer virus and VD without responsibility or accountability. HIV is probably not easily transmitted, but why unfairly expose soldiers? This profession is highly dangerous already. The military has a right to discriminate and be so-called homophobic. Would pro-homosexual people want their children to get a blood transfusion from a homosexual? Homosexuality is medically ruinous. Medical treatment is extremely expensive for HIV/AIDS patients. Female homosexuals have a higher VD (transmittable) and breast cancer risks. Who will pay for increased cost to military and VA hospitals?

Tailhook - Tailhook was an unfortunate event that the military is dealing with better than civilian organizations. Homosexual rights? What about homosexual responsibility? How many people did Tailhook kill?

Civil Rights - Should civil rights be granted to a group based on behavior? If yes, grant civil rights to rapists, murderers, drug users, drunk drivers, etc. Race is not a behavior. There is no comparison. Homosexuals are attempting to coat tail as a legitimate group. It would be strange to grant civil rights status based on bedroom activities, or, in this case, activity in parks and public rest rooms. Comparison of homosexuals to ethnic minorities is ludicrous and insulting to minority group members. The pro-homosexual arguments are not the same. How many homosexuals have been denied the right to vote, told to use certain bathrooms and water fountains, told to sit in the back of the bus? There are strong, logical reasons for denial of housing and employment (military, schools, churches, day care centers, government, etc). Homosexuals are not a minority. This is inconsistent with civil rights. Why would anybody pander to such a negative contributory group?

Mainstream Status - Homosexuals want to be considered mainstream citizens. However, they will not correct their

terrorist behavior - child molesting, spreading disease, etc. It is tragic that they have dramatically shortened their own life span, but it is criminal when they kill innocent human beings who behave in an acceptable manner. Does anybody who saw TV coverage of the April '93 March on Washington consider homosexuals mainstream?

Promoters of Homosexual Behavior - Do talk show hosts, actresses, singers, congress, and media personalities know more about the military than the Joint Chiefs-of-Staff? Absolutely not. More importantly, the large majority of military personnel of all ranks-from privates up-do not want homosexuals around, for a multitude of valid reasons. The armed forces should have much more weight given to their requirements than these other people who are not subject to military service or combat. But they continue to promote homosexuality. It is frightening that congress has life and death power over our military. Congress has members that commit homosexual acts (including at least one who is a child molester) but it has little military knowledge, and refuses to impartially gain that knowledge. One member of the Senate Armed Services Committee refused to visit a submarine, that carries 32 nuclear missiles, to gather information on working/living conditions. This is one that plans to sponsor a bill giving homosexuals, a behavioral group, full civil rights status. Who pays? Unfortunately, President Clinton, by his actions, is legitimizing and promoting homosexual behavior. Is he not promoting homosexuality? How can he say he wants to improve health care when he endorses high risk homosexual acts? Before becoming President, he knew more homosexuals than military people. He thinks there is a difference between behavior and status. Behavior equals status. He is not well founded to be the Commander-in-chief, but may well commit our forces to combat. He loathes the U.S. Military (U.S. News and World Report, March 15, 1993), and other documentation that he personally wrote. As his first official act as President, he announced that he intended to punish and damage the force by openly allowing high risk, child molesting homosexuals in what is now the world's best Armed Forces. He has blundered by making political appointments of people who also hate our military and who intend to inflict real damage by pursuing their own agenda. Does he care that children of military families would be at a greater risk of being molested? What about the integrity of the blood supply? Does he care that soldiers would be more susceptible to social and fatal diseases? Does he care about loss of unit cohesion, morale, readiness. This will get people killed in combat. Does he care? Rest assured he is aware of his plummeting support and popularity. Does he know why? There is no compelling need to lift the ban, but a massive amount of overwhelming reason, logic, and judgment, without any so-called homophobia or bigotry, to keep the ban. This problem was caused by the Democrats and we should vote accordingly. This is not to label all Democrats as promoters of homosexuality, but previously to this administration, military personnel and their families, were not being hostilely threatened. It is a good thing that they are a new kind of Democrat, and not the liberal, tax and spend Democrat. As the Commander-in-Chief, President Clinton has the responsibility to protect, not threaten the force. Does anybody care that by his actions the morale of our military has been hurt? Morale is the most important factor in winning wars. Is he a true leader who can admit his mistakes, stop pandering to a negative behavioral group, not further damage our military, and allow our military to be only concerned with national security.

Summary - It is unfortunate that many in congress have little frame of reference for our military. Congress is well aware of public opinion. We all need to contact our senators and representatives now. Phone them, write them. fax a copy of this and add/write in your own comments. Then just fold, tape and mail. Mail out many copies. Edmund Burke, a member of British Parliament and a supporter of the American Revolution said, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." If the ban is lifted, who should be blamed for the results if we choose not to take action? Act now!

Rep Louise McIntosh Slaughter
US House of Rep
1403 Longworth Bldg
Washington, DC
20515

TAPE TAPE TAPE